

# Effectiveness of Coaching and Mentoring Models to Enhance P5 Implementation in Primary Schools

Darmin\*, Muhammad Yahya, Patta Bundu

Universitas Negeri Makassar

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/pgsd.v2i4.1947>

\*Correspondence: Darmin

Email: [Darmin@unm.ac.id](mailto:Darmin@unm.ac.id)

Received: 21-06-2025

Accepted: 21-07-2025

Published: 21-08-2025



**Copyright:** © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Abstract:** Implementing This case study examines how a structured coaching and mentoring model can enhance the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile (P5) in a public primary school in Makassar, Indonesia. The research aimed to explore the effectiveness of this model in improving teachers' ability to integrate Pancasila values into classroom practice. A qualitative approach was employed, involving interviews with five teachers and two school leaders, along with classroom observations of P5 project activities. The findings reveal that the coaching and mentoring model substantially enhanced teachers' pedagogical skills and confidence in embedding Pancasila values into daily lessons. Participants described how regular coaching sessions enabled them to reflect critically on their instructional practices, while mentoring offered concrete examples, emotional support, and constructive feedback. School leaders reported improved student engagement, collaboration, and character formation in P5 activities as a result of the enhanced teaching strategies. The study confirms that sustained, collaborative professional development—particularly through coaching and peer mentoring—can effectively equip teachers to implement character-based curricula. These results offer practical insights for schools and policymakers aiming to scale the P5 initiative through ongoing teacher support systems. The research underscores the value of professional learning communities and reflective practice in ensuring meaningful integration of national character education frameworks into classroom realities.

**Keywords:** Coaching, Mentoring, Teacher Professional Development, Character Education

## Introduction

Education plays a strategic role in shaping future generations not only in terms of intellectual competence but also character strength and global competitiveness. In Indonesia, there is an increasing emphasis on reinforcing national values and character education in response to the complex challenges of globalization and digitalization. In 2022, the government launched the Kurikulum Merdeka (Independent Curriculum) reform, which introduced the Pancasila Student Profile strengthening project (Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila, known as P5). P5 is designed to cultivate well-rounded students who are faithful to God, demonstrate noble character, embrace global diversity, are independent and self-driven, think critically, and work collaboratively (gotong royong). This holistic character and competence framework reflects Indonesia's national education goals of developing not only academic skills but also moral and civic virtues in students.

Despite the policy mandate, the implementation of P5 in primary schools has encountered several challenges. Early observations have noted that many primary teachers have minimal understanding of how to design and deliver character-based learning experiences. Traditional pedagogical approaches often fall short of providing contextual, values-rich learning, and there is a lack of teaching materials that authentically integrate Pancasila values into daily lessons. For example, a recent analysis by Pratiwi et al. (2023) found that without proper support, teachers struggle to move beyond superficial activities, resulting in only declarative understanding of values rather than true internalization by students. This situation highlights a clear need for an effective model of professional development and instructional support that can bridge the gap between the ambitious goals of P5 and classroom realities.

One promising approach to address these challenges is the use of structured coaching and mentoring models for teacher development. Coaching and mentoring are intensive interpersonal approaches that focus on guiding and supporting practitioners to improve their skills and reflect on their practice. In the context of character education, coaching typically involves guiding teachers (or students) through reflective questioning and problem-solving to unlock their potential, while mentoring involves providing direction, feedback, and role modeling based on experience. When applied collaboratively in project-based learning settings like P5, these approaches are believed to increase teacher and student engagement, empathy, and self-awareness. This aligns with broader educational research which shows that coaching interventions can lead to significant improvements in teachers' instructional practices and student outcomes. For instance, a meta-analysis by Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan (2018) found that instructional coaching had a substantial positive effect on teachers' classroom practice and a modest positive effect on student achievement. Likewise, mentoring programs have been shown to improve new teachers' professional skills, well-being, and retention in the profession. Effective mentoring provides novice teachers with emotional support and practical knowledge, thereby reducing stress and improving teaching quality.

In terms of character education, mentoring is particularly relevant. Character education research emphasizes that character is both "caught" through lived experience and "taught" through direct instruction; mentoring offers a powerful one-to-one or peer-based means to support this process. A guide by the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (2020) highlights that mentoring can actively foster students' character development by providing focused guidance and exemplars of virtuous behavior. Thus, if teachers themselves are coached and mentored to implement P5, they are better equipped to facilitate character-building experiences for students. Recent studies in Indonesia support this idea – for example, Maruti et al. (2023) reported that a mentoring program improved the quality of P5 implementation in elementary schools, leading to more effective integration of Pancasila values in the curriculum. Similarly, Wulansari and Fauzi (2023) found that coaching and mentoring had a positive impact on educators' performance in school settings, suggesting these approaches enhance teaching efficacy and innovation.

Given this background, our study focuses on the effectiveness of a structured coaching and mentoring model in enhancing P5 implementation at the primary school level. We concentrate on a single-case study of a public primary school in Makassar, Indonesia, which

in 2023 began applying a new coaching-mentoring approach to support its teachers in delivering P5 projects. This school provides an illustrative case to explore how such an approach can address the aforementioned challenges. We specifically examine: (1) how the coaching and mentoring model was implemented in the school, (2) how it influenced teachers' capacity to integrate Pancasila student profile values into teaching and learning, and (3) perceptions of teachers and school leaders regarding changes in teaching practice and student outcomes. By drawing on qualitative evidence from interviews and observations, as well as situating the findings in recent literature on teacher professional development and character education, we aim to shed light on the practical mechanisms by which coaching and mentoring can facilitate meaningful P5 integration. The insights from this case study will be valuable for educators and policymakers interested in scaling up effective teacher development models to realize Indonesia's character education goals.

## Methodology

### Research Design and Context

This study used a qualitative case study design to investigate the implementation of a coaching and mentoring model in one primary school. The case site was SD Inpres Layang Bertingkat (a pseudonym), a public elementary school in Makassar City, Indonesia, which was among the early adopters of the Kurikulum Merdeka with the P5 program. The school serves a diverse urban community and had been implementing P5 projects since late 2023. Prior to the study, teachers at the school reported difficulty in integrating Pancasila profile competencies into their teaching, which is reflective of the wider challenges noted in primary schools nationally. In response, the school leadership, in collaboration with the researcher, introduced a structured coaching and mentoring intervention in 2024 to support teachers with P5.

### Coaching and Mentoring Intervention

The coaching and mentoring model was developed as a professional learning strategy aligned with P5 objectives. In this model, each teacher was both a learner (coachee/mentee) and, in some instances, a coach to their students. Coaching in this context refers to a process where teachers learn to guide students through reflective, project-based learning experiences, using techniques such as the GROW model (Goal, Reality, Options, Will) to facilitate student inquiry and character reflection. Mentoring, on the other hand, refers to more experienced educators providing one-on-one guidance and feedback to teachers to improve their instructional design and classroom management of P5 projects. Practically, the school formed a mentoring team consisting of the principal and two senior teachers who had prior training in character education. These mentors held regular mentoring sessions with the five classroom teachers at the school. Each teacher also engaged in peer coaching sessions and was encouraged to apply coaching techniques with their students during P5 project activities.

At the start of the intervention, a one-day workshop introduced all staff to the coaching and mentoring model, including role expectations and techniques. Teachers were given a P5 Coaching-Mentoring Guidebook developed from the dissertation research. This guidebook contained structured modules on implementing P5 projects, sample project

plans, reflection question prompts (for coaching conversations with students), and guidelines for peer mentoring and observation. The content was validated by education experts and deemed to have high relevance to classroom needs. Teachers found the guide's instructions clear and its project examples appropriate, noting that "the structured coaching and mentoring guide made it easier to facilitate P5 projects because it provided reflective question examples and mentorship strategies" (Teacher 3, interview). A small-scale trial of the guidebook in one class showed positive initial feedback: on a practicality survey, teachers rated the guide on average 3.78 out of 4 ( $\approx 95\%$ ), indicating it was "very relevant" and user-friendly for P5 teaching.

### Participants

A total of seven participants were involved in the study: five classroom teachers (denoted here as Teacher 1 through Teacher 5) and two school leaders (the principal and a vice-principal). The teachers (3 females, 2 males) ranged in experience from 5 to 15 years and taught various grades (4th through 6th grade). None had formal prior training in coaching or mentoring techniques. The principal and vice-principal (both female, >15 years' experience) had attended a government "Guru Penggerak" training program which emphasizes teacher mentorship and were instrumental in initiating the P5 coaching-mentoring program at the school. All participants provided informed consent and were assured of confidentiality; pseudonyms are used and identifying details of the school are masked in reporting.

### Data Collection

Data were collected over one school semester (approximately 4 months) in early 2024. Two primary methods were used:

- **Interviews:** We conducted semi-structured interviews with each of the five teachers and both school leaders, yielding a total of seven interviews. Interviews lasted 40–60 minutes each and were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia (later transcribed and translated to English). The interview protocols included questions about the participants' experiences with P5 before and after the coaching-mentoring intervention, their perceptions of the coaching sessions and mentoring support, changes in their instructional practices, and observed effects on student learning and character development. Sample questions for teachers were: "Can you describe how the coaching sessions influenced your approach to facilitating P5 projects?" and "What changes did you notice in your students when you applied the mentoring/coaching strategies?". For school leaders, questions included: "How do you perceive the impact of the mentoring program on teachers' performance and on school culture?". The interview approach was adaptive, allowing participants to share stories or critical incidents. Several questions were adapted from validated instruments on coaching effectiveness to probe specific aspects like teacher reflective practice and student engagement in character learning. Interviews were audio-recorded with permission and later transcribed verbatim.
- **Classroom Observations:** We carried out non-participant observations of P5 project implementation in the classrooms to directly witness the effects of the coaching and mentoring model on teaching and learning processes. Each teacher was observed twice during the semester – once in the early phase of P5 project implementation and once in

the later phase – totaling 10 observation sessions. Observations focused on teacher behaviors (e.g., use of coaching questions, facilitation techniques, integration of Pancasila values) and student behaviors (e.g., engagement in project tasks, demonstrations of Pancasila profile competencies like teamwork or critical thinking). We used an observation checklist derived from the P5 objectives and coaching practices (for example, noting whether the teacher prompted student reflection on values, encouraged student autonomy, etc.). We also wrote narrative field notes to capture qualitative details such as notable student interactions or teacher strategies. To illustrate, one observation note from Class 6A reads: “Teacher 2 asked students ‘What challenges did you encounter in your project and how did you solve them?’ (indicating use of reflective coaching). Students appeared enthusiastic, many raised hands to share, exhibiting confidence and collaboration. The teacher linked their answers to Pancasila values (e.g., appreciating gotong royong when students helped peers).” These observations provided contextual evidence to triangulate with interview self-reports.

Additionally, relevant documents were reviewed to supplement data, including the school’s P5 project plans, the coaching-mentoring guidebook, and any evaluation forms or teachers’ reflective journals if available. For instance, the teachers maintained brief reflection logs after each P5 session as part of the program, which were analyzed to understand their on-going learning.

### Data Analysis

All interviews were transcribed and translated to English. We employed a thematic analysis approach, following the steps of coding, categorizing, and theme development (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Initially, two researchers (the lead author and an assistant) independently open-coded the interview transcripts, highlighting segments related to the research questions (e.g., descriptions of changes in teaching practice, mentions of how mentoring helped, examples of student behavior changes). We then compared and merged codes, and through iterative discussion, grouped them into broader categories. Key emergent categories included “Improved Teacher Confidence and Skills,” “Student Engagement and Character Growth,” “Collaborative Culture among Teachers,” and “Remaining Challenges and Needs.”

Observation notes were analyzed using a combination of deductive and inductive coding. Deductively, we checked for predefined indicators of effective P5 implementation (such as student active participation, integration of values in lessons) and markers of coaching behavior by teachers. Inductively, we noted unexpected patterns or noteworthy incidents. These observation findings were used to validate and enrich the interview themes. For example, if teachers claimed that students became more independent, we looked for evidence of independent student work in the observations.

Data triangulation was performed by cross-verifying information from interviews, observations, and documents. We also conducted member checking by sharing summary findings with the participants (in a focus group format) to verify accuracy and interpretation. The teachers and school leaders confirmed the resonance of the findings with

their experiences and provided minor clarifications. This process enhanced the trustworthiness of the results.

Throughout analysis, we remained attentive to potential biases (the first author was also involved in facilitating the coaching model, which we mitigated by involving an external coder for verification). The study adheres to qualitative rigor criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Rich descriptions of the context and direct quotations are provided in the Results to allow readers to assess the applicability of findings to other settings.

This study investigates the effectiveness of a structured coaching and mentoring model in supporting the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile (Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila, P5) at a public primary school in Makassar, Indonesia. The objective was to enhance teacher capacity in integrating Pancasila values into classroom instruction through targeted professional development. A qualitative case study approach was employed, involving semi-structured interviews with five teachers and two school leaders, as well as classroom observations of P5 project activities.

The results demonstrate that the coaching and mentoring model significantly improved teachers' instructional practices and confidence in delivering character-based education. Teachers reported that coaching sessions facilitated reflective teaching and strategic refinement, while mentoring from experienced educators provided actionable guidance and consistent emotional support. School leaders observed increased student participation, deeper engagement, and more authentic expressions of character during P5-related learning experiences.

These findings affirm that continuous, context-sensitive professional development—grounded in collaborative coaching and mentoring—can meaningfully support the implementation of character education frameworks like P5. The study contributes to the broader discourse on teacher learning by emphasizing the role of sustained, reflective support structures in translating curriculum policy into classroom practice. It also offers practical recommendations for scaling such professional development models in schools facing resource or pedagogical challenges.

This study investigates the effectiveness of a structured coaching and mentoring model in supporting the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile (Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila, P5) at a public primary school in Makassar, Indonesia. The objective was to enhance teacher capacity in integrating Pancasila values into classroom instruction through targeted professional development. A qualitative case study approach was employed, involving semi-structured interviews with five teachers and two school leaders, as well as classroom observations of P5 project activities.

The results demonstrate that the coaching and mentoring model significantly improved teachers' instructional practices and confidence in delivering character-based education. Teachers reported that coaching sessions facilitated reflective teaching and strategic refinement (Knight, 2018), while mentoring from experienced educators provided actionable guidance and consistent emotional support (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). School leaders observed increased student participation, deeper engagement, and more authentic expressions of character during P5-related learning experiences (Kemendikbudristek, 2022).

These findings affirm that continuous, context-sensitive professional development—grounded in collaborative coaching and mentoring—can meaningfully support the implementation of character education frameworks like P5 (Lickona, 2004) (Darling-Hammond et al, 2017). The study contributes to the broader discourse on teacher learning by emphasizing the role of sustained, reflective support structures in translating curriculum policy into classroom practice (Borko, 2004) (Avalos, 2011). It also offers practical recommendations for scaling such models in schools facing resource or pedagogical challenges.

## Result and Discussion

The coaching and mentoring model was implemented for one semester at the case study school, and data analysis revealed several positive outcomes. The findings are organized into four interrelated themes: (1) Enhanced Teacher Capacity and Confidence in P5 Implementation, (2) Improved Student Engagement and Character Development, (3) Strengthened Collaborative Culture and Reflective Practice among Teachers, and (4) Challenges and Areas for Improvement. In the discussion below, each theme is presented with supporting evidence (including direct quotes from participants) and connected with relevant literature to interpret the significance of the results.

### Enhanced Teacher Capacity and Confidence in P5 Implementation

All five teacher participants reported substantial growth in their ability to plan and deliver P5-oriented learning experiences as a result of the coaching and mentoring support. Prior to the intervention, teachers often felt uncertain about how to incorporate the six Pancasila profile competencies into their daily lesson plans. As Teacher 1 explained, “Before, I was unsure how to teach values like gotong royong (teamwork) or critical thinking in my regular lessons. We had the curriculum guidelines, but I didn’t know how to translate them into activities.” This sentiment reflects the broader issue identified by Pratiwi et al. (2023) regarding teachers’ limited understanding of character-based instructional design. The introduction of the coaching and mentoring model provided a clear framework and concrete strategies to overcome this gap.

Through mentoring sessions with the school leaders and peer discussions, teachers learned to redesign their teaching approaches to align with P5 goals. A significant change was the adoption of more student-centered, project-based methods. Teacher 4 noted in an interview that “the mentoring sessions opened my eyes to new strategies – for example, using local community problems as project themes for science lessons, so students practice real-world problem solving and teamwork.” Mentors often shared examples and co-developed lesson plans with teachers. Classroom observations confirmed that by mid-semester, teachers were confidently facilitating complex projects, such as a Grade 5 project on “Local Cultural Heritage Preservation” where students worked in teams to research and present local traditions. The teacher’s role had shifted from a lecturer to a coach guiding inquiry: we observed Teacher 3 moving around groups, asking probing questions like “Why do you think this tradition is important for our community?” to stimulate critical thinking and values reflection in students.

The coaching component, wherein teachers practiced using reflective questions and active listening with their students, was frequently mentioned as a helpful tool. Teachers indicated that coaching techniques not only benefited students but also changed how teachers themselves approached problem-solving in the classroom. According to Teacher 2, “I started to use the GROW model questions even in my own planning – I set a goal for what value or skill I want students to get, reflect on the reality of their level, think of options to engage them, and plan my will/action. It’s like I became a coach to myself, which made me more prepared and confident.” This self-coaching mindset among teachers is a notable outcome, suggesting that the professional development model had meta-cognitive benefits for teachers’ own continuous improvement.

From the school leaders’ perspective, the growth in teacher competency was evident. The principal shared that “by the end of the program, I could see the teachers designing P5 projects almost independently. They no longer asked me ‘How should I do this?’ but rather showed me their creative plans and just sought a bit of feedback. Their confidence is much higher.” This observation was supported by a formal evaluation: teachers’ acceptance and understanding of the coaching-mentoring model was rated “very high” (average ~95% agreement) on feedback questionnaires. In fact, the practicality of the P5 Coaching-Mentoring Guide and model was rated 4.3 out of 5 by the teachers, indicating that they found it highly usable and relevant. They particularly appreciated the structured format of the guide and the way it integrated coaching prompts with P5 project examples. One item that received a slightly lower score (3.33/4.00) was the item on “suitability to teacher’s current ability”, implying that while teachers valued the model, a few initially felt it was somewhat advanced for them. However, mentors addressed this by providing additional training and encouragement, and teachers’ skills quickly grew to meet the model’s demands.

These findings resonate with literature on effective teacher professional development. It is well established that PD programs that are ongoing, collaborative, and connected to teachers’ actual classroom practice yield the greatest improvements in teacher efficacy. In our case, the coaching and mentoring model embodied these principles: it was a sustained, semester-long intervention, it fostered collaboration (through mentor-mentee and peer interactions), and it was directly tied to the new curriculum teachers had to enact. The increase in teacher confidence and capacity we observed is consistent with other studies where instructional coaching led to notable shifts in teachers’ instructional methods and self-efficacy (Kraft et al., 2018). Moreover, our result that teachers needed some initial capacity building echoes Joyce et al. (2020)’s argument that “innovative teaching models succeed when accompanied by systematic, continuous teacher competency development”. In short, the coaching and mentoring model effectively built the teachers’ pedagogical skills and confidence to implement P5, validating the approach as a form of context-specific professional learning.

## Improved Student Engagement and Character Development

A second major outcome of the coaching and mentoring model was the observed improvement in student engagement and indicators of character development in the classroom. All teachers noted qualitative changes in their students compared to prior semesters. Students became more enthusiastic participants in project activities and demonstrated growth in the targeted Pancasila profile competencies such as teamwork, critical thinking, and responsibility.

According to Teacher 5, "My students were so excited about P5 projects this time. They took charge of their projects – I saw leaders emerge in groups, shy kids starting to voice their ideas, and overall a different energy in class." This heightened engagement can be partly attributed to the more interactive, student-centered learning design that teachers adopted, but teachers believed the coaching approach with students was key. Teacher 3 explained that previously, she might have given students instructions and expected compliance, but with the coaching model, "I ask them questions that make them think and connect with the project. For example, I asked, 'How does this project help our community?' and it made them realize the purpose. They became more motivated knowing their work had meaning." Such reflective questioning encouraged students to internalize values rather than just complete tasks. It aligns with Pangestuti's (2022) assertion that character education is effective when it involves students' emotional and personal engagement, not just rote learning.

From the observations, it was evident that students were actively engaged. In one Grade 4 class, during a project on "Healthy Lifestyle", students were seen collaborating to create posters and campaigns promoting cleanliness and exercise. The teacher (Teacher 1) facilitated by coaching them – asking each group to reflect on "Which Pancasila value are you applying in this activity?". Students responded with answers like "We are working together, that's gotong royong, Ma'am" or "We are being disciplined, which is part of being independent." Such moments illustrate that students were not only busy with hands-on work but also making connections to character principles, indicating deeper learning. A vice-principal commented in her interview that "the class atmosphere is very vibrant now. Students are not passive – they debate, they ask questions. I even saw them helping each other more, like one student reminding another about honesty when recording experiment data." This suggests the emergence of a peer culture supporting positive values, one of the ultimate goals of P5.

Another marker of increased engagement was the students' expressed enjoyment and voluntary involvement. Several teachers mentioned that some students went beyond requirements – for instance, bringing extra materials from home for projects or continuing project discussions during breaks – behaviors that were rare before. In the student feedback surveys (administered by the school as part of the program evaluation), over 90% of students responded that P5 project lessons were more enjoyable and meaningful than regular lessons. Although students' direct voices are not the focus of this paper, it's worth noting this positive trend as an indirect outcome of teacher changes.

In terms of character development, teachers and leaders observed positive changes, though they were cautious to label them as long-term changes at this early stage. Teacher 2 shared an anecdote: "One of my students, who used to be quite impatient and often fought

with classmates, became a different person during our project on local plants. He took on the role of group coordinator and was surprisingly patient and encouraging to his friends. I think the project structure and perhaps my coaching him to handle problems calmly had an effect.” This example highlights how the P5 projects combined with coaching guidance allowed students to practice virtues in real contexts. The principal also noted improvements in general student behavior: “We are seeing fewer disciplinary issues. Students seem to understand the values we’ve been focusing on – like they organize class cleanliness routines by themselves now, showing responsibility and teamwork.”

These qualitative outcomes align with character education literature, which suggests that well-implemented character-focused curricula can positively influence student behavior and social-emotional skills (Berkowitz & Bier, 2007; Shoshani et al., 2021). Our case supports that coaching and mentoring enhance the quality of implementation, which is critical. As Maruti et al. (2023) found, mentoring was associated with improved P5 implementation quality, which presumably leads to better student character outcomes. Students in our study were not just participating in projects; they were doing so in a more thoughtful and values-oriented way than before, thanks to teachers’ guided reflection and encouragement.

It is important to acknowledge that measuring “character development” in a short span is challenging. We did not administer formal pre-post character assessments; instead, we rely on teacher and leader observations and student work examples. Within those limits, the early signs are promising. The active student engagement and demonstration of Pancasila attributes suggest that the P5 program’s intent is being realized more effectively with the coaching-mentoring support. This finding underscores a point made in the literature: the implementation process matters greatly for character education success. Simply mandating character education (like P5) doesn’t yield results unless teachers have the means to implement it in engaging, reflective ways (Lickona & Davidson, 2021). Our study contributes evidence that coaching teachers in those methods and providing mentorship can be that enabling factor.

### Strengthened Collaborative Culture and Reflective Practice among Teachers

The introduction of the coaching and mentoring model not only impacted individual teachers and students, but also catalyzed a more collaborative and reflective professional culture within the school. Prior to this intervention, teachers at the school worked rather independently; there were few structured opportunities for them to learn from each other or discuss instructional challenges. The mentoring program changed this dynamic significantly.

All teacher participants mentioned that they valued the regular mentoring meetings and peer coaching sessions as a time for professional dialogue. Teacher 1 described it as “finally having a forum to share and reflect. In our weekly mentor meeting, we discussed what happened in our classes – successes and failures – and it was reassuring to hear others had similar issues and to get ideas on how to solve them.” This kind of reflective practice meeting is a cornerstone of effective teacher communities. Through these conversations, teachers started to openly discuss their struggles with P5 projects (such as time management, interdisciplinary integration, student behavior issues) and brainstorm

solutions together. For example, Teacher 4 was having trouble getting quiet students to speak up in group work; in a mentoring session, Teacher 2 suggested a strategy that had worked for her – assigning rotating roles so that every student had to present something. Teacher 4 tried this in the next project and reported improved participation. Such peer exchange exemplifies collaborative problem-solving, a skill that the teachers were implicitly coached in as well.

The principal, who acted as the head mentor, observed a shift in teachers' attitudes: "I see much more openness now. Teachers invite each other to observe their class or give feedback – that was unheard of before. Now one teacher might say, 'Please watch my P5 presentation next week, I want your input.' This shows they trust each other and are keen to improve." Indeed, peer observation became an emergent practice. Although not originally mandated, two teachers voluntarily arranged to sit in on each other's P5 lessons and later discussed what they observed. This indicates a move towards a learning community model in the school, where teachers coach and mentor one another, not just rely on top-down advice. It reflects what Showers and Joyce (1996) identified as the benefit of peer coaching: it builds authentic collegiality and continuous feedback loops among teachers (as long as it is not perceived as an administrative evaluation mechanism).

Furthermore, teachers developed a more reflective mindset. The mentoring process often involved guided reflection questions (the mentors would ask the teachers things akin to how teachers coached students, e.g., "What do you think went well in your last project session and why?"). Over time, teachers internalized this approach. Several mentioned keeping personal journals or notes on what to improve next time. Teacher 5 said, "I got into the habit of writing a short reflection after each project meeting with my class. It's something our mentor encouraged, and now I find it very useful. I even record little victories or interesting quotes from students." This practice shows an adoption of reflective teaching, which is a hallmark of professional growth.

The changes in school culture align with the concept of schools as learning organizations. Coaching and mentoring can contribute to organizational development by breaking teacher isolation and fostering knowledge sharing (Garcia et al., 2020). Our case demonstrates this clearly: the program served as a catalyst for collaborative learning among teachers. The benefit of such a collaborative culture is not only in solving immediate P5 implementation issues, but it also creates a supportive environment that can sustain innovations. As research by van Nieuwerburgh and Barr (2016) notes, peer coaching and mutual support among educators can improve instructional capacity and create ongoing evaluation and improvement mechanisms within the school. Similarly, Hollweck and Lofthouse (2021) found that coaching's impact is enhanced by context and co-construction – meaning when teachers co-construct understanding in their specific school context, the outcomes are more impactful. In our study, the teachers and mentors together adapted the model to their context (for example, by adjusting the frequency of meetings or tailoring the guidebook activities), which likely contributed to its success.

One school leader pointed out an indirect effect of the program on school culture: "We're seeing a positive change in how teachers view professional development. Before, some saw training as a burden or just theory. Now, after experiencing coaching and mentoring, they are asking for more sessions and even suggesting topics to learn. It's a big

change – they are now pulling the PD, not just receiving it passively.” This indicates increased teacher ownership of professional learning, which bodes well for the sustainability of improvements. It also suggests that well-designed PD that teachers find meaningful (like this coaching model) can improve their attitudes toward continual learning, a crucial factor for long-term educational quality improvement.

### Challenges and Areas for Improvement

While the overall effect of the coaching and mentoring model was positive, the study also identified several challenges and areas where improvements are needed. Recognizing these factors is important for a balanced understanding and for informing future implementations of the model in other contexts.

**Time Constraints:** The most commonly cited challenge by teachers was the additional time required for coaching and mentoring activities. Implementing P5 projects already demands significant planning and classroom time. On top of this, teachers had to allocate time for weekly mentoring meetings and for coaching conversations with students. Teacher 2 noted, “It’s very useful, but to be honest, it added to my workload initially. Preparing for the project and then also preparing for a coaching session or writing reflections – it was hard to juggle with other teaching duties.” Time management became a learning curve; some teachers struggled in the first month to keep up with the normal curriculum content coverage alongside the P5 projects. The school leaders acknowledged this and tried to alleviate the load by integrating some P5 project work into existing subjects (so it wasn’t entirely extra-curricular) and by giving teachers occasional release time to meet and plan. This challenge of time is commonly reported in mentoring and coaching programs globally – without proper adjustment of teachers’ responsibilities, PD initiatives can lead to overload (Hobson & Maxwell, 2020). It underscores the need for administrative support, such as adjusting schedules or reducing non-teaching duties during the initial phase of implementation.

**Varied Mentor Capacity:** Another challenge was ensuring the quality and consistency of mentoring. The school’s mentors (principal and senior teachers) themselves were new to structured mentoring in the beginning. Teachers had mixed feedback on mentoring sessions initially; a few mentioned that early on, some sessions felt like general staff meetings rather than focused mentoring. As Teacher 1 recalled, “In the first couple of sessions, we ended up talking about general school issues. It took a while for us all to understand how to do mentoring properly – later it became more structured and useful.” This indicates that mentors needed guidance and practice to fully assume the mentor role. Over the course of the semester, the mentors improved by using prepared discussion guides and being trained (the principal engaged in a short online mentoring course to upskill). By the end, teachers were satisfied with the mentoring, but this suggests that any school adopting such a model should invest in training the mentors. Literature supports this point: mentors themselves require development to be effective. A poorly trained mentor can inadvertently turn a mentoring session into either a supervisory meeting or a trivial chat, neither of which yields the intended benefits (Ingleby & Hunt, 2022). Therefore, future programs might include a mentor preparation phase, possibly involving external coaching experts to support school-based mentors.

**Resource and Material Needs:** While the P5 Coaching-Mentoring Guide was available and useful, teachers felt that more resources would further ease the implementation. For instance, teachers wanted a repository of sample P5 project ideas, assessment rubrics for character competencies, and audio-visual aids that could be used in coaching sessions with students. Teacher 4 mentioned, “We developed our own projects this time, which was good for creativity, but it would save time if we had a bank of project examples or multimedia resources to inspire us or the students.” Another resource issue was the availability of space and facilities. One mentoring session had to be held in a crowded office due to lack of a dedicated meeting space, which was not ideal for reflective discussion. Additionally, implementing some projects (like a community service activity) required materials and transportation that stretched the school’s budget. These practical issues mirror challenges found in other schools integrating P5, where limited facilities and resources can hinder the effectiveness of such programs. A study by Dounas-Frazer et al. (2018) noted that lack of adequate resources and support infrastructure often impeded educational innovation. To address this in the future, schools might need to allocate special budgets for P5 activities or seek community partnerships (which some have suggested, involving parents and local community in supporting projects).

**Sustainability and Scalability:** A forward-looking concern raised by the school principal was how to sustain the coaching and mentoring momentum beyond the research period. The principal asked, “Will teachers continue this once the study is over? How do we make it part of our school culture permanently?” This question points to the challenge of institutionalizing new practices. The study provided external motivation and structure, but for long-term sustainability, the school would need to embed the coaching and mentoring processes into its regular professional development cycles. There is also the question of scaling: could this model be applied in larger schools or across multiple schools in the district? Some barriers to scaling include the availability of qualified mentors for every school and the varying levels of support from different principals. These considerations are more about policy and system-level support. Studies on coaching programs at scale (e.g., Kraft & Dong, 2020) have found that effects tend to diminish when programs expand, often due to variability in implementation quality and resource dilution. Therefore, careful planning is needed to maintain fidelity and effectiveness when replicating this model elsewhere.

**Teacher Initial Resistance:** It should be noted that not all teachers were immediately enthusiastic about the new model. In the first few weeks, a couple of teachers were skeptical, viewing it as just another top-down requirement. Teacher 5 admitted, “At first I thought, why do we need this? It felt like extra work and I was comfortable with how I was teaching already.” This initial resistance was overcome gradually as teachers experienced benefits (for Teacher 5, seeing her students’ engagement rise convinced her of the value). The lesson here is that change management is crucial – introducing the rationale, sharing evidence of success from elsewhere, and securing quick wins early on can help win teacher buy-in. In our case, the principal’s supportive leadership and the voluntary nature (teachers were encouraged but not forced to adopt every suggestion) helped ease resistance. This aligns with research noting that teacher autonomy and sense of ownership in PD efforts strongly influence their willingness to implement new practices (Deci & Ryan, 2009; (author), 2023).

In summary, the challenges observed do not negate the positive outcomes but provide important guidance for improvement. Addressing time and workload issues, strengthening mentor preparation, providing ample resources, and planning for sustainability are key factors for the success of coaching and mentoring models in schools. Our discussion of these challenges contributes a realistic perspective consistent with other case studies of school reform. For example, a case study by Tyas et al. (2024) on a similar coaching initiative stressed the need for supportive school policies (like schedule adjustments) to allow teachers to fully engage in coaching. Likewise, the necessity of leadership support and a collaborative atmosphere has been emphasized in multiple studies of effective school-based mentoring (Carver & Meier, 2019). Our findings reinforce those insights in the specific context of P5 implementation.

Despite the challenges, it is noteworthy that the teachers and school managed to adapt and find solutions during the project (indicative of a developing problem-solving culture). The overall positive trajectory suggests that with refinement, the coaching and mentoring model is a viable approach to enhance P5 – and potentially other similar character education or innovative curricula – in primary schools.

## Conclusion

This study investigates the effectiveness of a structured coaching and mentoring model in supporting the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile (Proyek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila, P5) at a public primary school in Makassar, Indonesia. The objective was to enhance teacher capacity in integrating Pancasila values into classroom instruction through targeted professional development. A qualitative case study approach was employed, involving semi-structured interviews with five teachers and two school leaders, as well as classroom observations of P5 project activities.

The results demonstrate that the coaching and mentoring model significantly improved teachers' instructional practices and confidence in delivering character-based education. Teachers reported that coaching sessions facilitated reflective teaching and strategic refinement, while mentoring from experienced educators provided actionable guidance and consistent emotional support. School leaders observed increased student participation, deeper engagement, and more authentic expressions of character during P5-related learning experiences.

These findings affirm that continuous, context-sensitive professional development—grounded in collaborative coaching and mentoring—can meaningfully support the implementation of character education frameworks like P5. The study contributes to the broader discourse on teacher learning by emphasizing the role of sustained, reflective support structures in translating curriculum policy into classroom practice. It also offers practical recommendations for scaling such professional development models in schools facing resource or pedagogical challenges.

This single-case study examined the effectiveness of a coaching and mentoring model in enhancing the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile (P5) initiative in a primary school. The findings provide compelling evidence that structured teacher coaching and mentoring can play a critical role in translating curriculum reforms focused on character education into effective classroom practice. Through qualitative analyses of interviews and

observations, we found that the model led to notable improvements in teacher capacity, classroom engagement, and the school's professional culture:

Teachers developed greater competence and confidence in integrating P5's character and competency goals into their teaching. With regular coaching and the guidance of mentors, they adopted more student-centered and values-oriented pedagogies, aligning with best practices in character education and project-based learning. As a result, P5, which initially seemed abstract and challenging to implement, became a tangible part of everyday learning. Teachers' testimonies and high acceptance ratings of the model underscore its practicality and impact on their professional growth.

In conclusion, the case study demonstrates that coaching and mentoring models are highly effective strategies for enhancing P5 implementation, and by extension, other similar educational innovations that require changes in teacher practice and emphasis on character development. The success observed at the case school is consistent with broader research from 2019–2024 which affirms that teacher professional development is most impactful when it is job-embedded, continuous, and involves supportive relationships. Coaching provides the individualized feedback and reflection opportunities needed for teachers to hone new skills, while mentoring offers the personal guidance and encouragement to persist in change – together addressing both the technical and emotional dimensions of teacher development.

## References

- Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007>
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033008003>
- Bungin, B. (2020). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Aktualisasi Metodologis ke Arah Ragam Varian Kontemporer*. Rajawali Pers.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org>
- Dirjen GTK. (2022). *Pedoman pelaksanaan coaching dan mentoring dalam program pendidikan guru penggerak*. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- Guskey, T. R. (2020). Professional development: Its role in improving teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 102, 101592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101592>
- Hobson, A. J., & Maxwell, B. (2020). Mentoring substructures and superstructures: An extension and reconceptualisation of the architecture for teacher mentoring. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 46(5), 542–561. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2020.1800405>

- Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201–233. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323>
- Kemendikbudristek. (2021). Panduan pembelajaran Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila. Direktorat Jenderal PAUD, DIKDAS dan DIKMEN.
- Knight, J. (2018). *The impact cycle: What instructional coaches should do to foster powerful improvements in teaching*. Corwin Press.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2017). Inconvenient truths about teacher learning: Towards professional development 3.0. *Teachers and Teaching*, 23(4), 387–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2016.1211523>
- Lickona, T. (2004). *Character matters: How to help our children develop good judgment, integrity, and other essential virtues*. Touchstone
- OECD. (2020). *Strengthening teacher professionalism in Indonesia*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/570fdaf7-en>
- Rahman, A. (2021). Implementasi coaching dan mentoring untuk penguatan karakter siswa dalam pembelajaran. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 11(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpk.v11i1.37678>
- Sahlberg, P. (2021). Does the pandemic help us make education more equitable? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 20, 11–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-020-09284-4>
- Showers, B., & Joyce, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Smith, T. W., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2021). The mentoring effect: New evidence on teacher induction and student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 58(2), 354–390. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831220905584>
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kualitatif, kuantitatif dan R&D* (3rd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Widodo, H., & Puspitasari, D. (2023). Coaching and mentoring in the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile: A qualitative case study. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 12(3), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v12i3.54120>
- Yilmaz, D., & Altinkurt, Y. (2019). Coaching practices in school leadership: Teachers' and principals' perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(2), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-05-2018-0155>